DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 278 078 CS 505 494

AUTHOR Strohkirch, C. Sue; Parks, Malcolm R.
TITLE General and Context Dependent Relationships between Communication Apprehension and Gender Role Orientation.
PUB DATE Nov 86
NOTE 30p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Speech Communication Association (72nd, Chicago, IL, November 13-16, 1986).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Communication Apprehension; Communication Research; *Communication Skills; Interpersonal Communication; *Psychological Evaluation; *Psychological Patterns; Public Speaking; *Sex Differences; Sex Stereotypes
IDENTIFIERS *Psychological Gender

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to replicate and extend previous research on the relationship between communication apprehension (CA), biological sex, and psychological gender. With the objective of reducing the potential for instrument bias, the possibilities for context dependent effects were explored to a greater degree than in past studies and multiple measures were employed. Analysis of a survey completed by 291 undergraduate subjects indicated clear differences in the overall level of CA experienced by subjects of differing self-reported psychological genders. Feminine individuals reported higher levels of CA across all measures than did androgynous or masculine individuals. Findings supported the theoretical rationale that sex-typed individuals experience greater apprehension than androgynous individuals because their communication skills and expectations restricted them to a narrower range of situational competencies. Results showed that the measures of psychological gender were more powerful predictors than biological sex. Moreover, results indicated that the relationship between CA and psychological gender is predominantly cross-situational and relatively free of context dependent interaction. Individuals who were undifferentiated in terms of psychological gender were found more likely to experience the greatest overall CA. In general, individuals were found to experience the least CA in dyadic situations, more apprehension in group contexts, and the most CA in public speaking contexts. A three-page reference list is provided. (JD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

ED278078

GENERAL AND CONTEXT DEPENDENT RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN COMMUNICATION APPREHENSION AND GENDER ROLE ORIENTATION

C. Sue Strohkirch

Malcolm R. Parks

Department of Speech Communication DL-15

University of Washington

Seattle, Washington 98195

Paper presented to the Commission on Communication Apprehension and Avoidance of the Speech Communication Association, Chicago, ILlinois, Nov. 13-16, 1986

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
C. Sue Strohkirch
Malcolm R. Parks
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Please address all correspondence to C. Sue Strohkirch at the Department of Speech Communication DL-15, University of Washington, Seattle, WA 98195. Telephone messages may be left at 206-543-4860.

CS505494

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

GENERAL AND CONTEXT DEPENDENT RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN

COMMUNICATION APPREHENSION AND GENDER ROLE ORIENTATION

Abstract

The purpose of this study was to replicate and extend previous research on the relationship between communication apprehension, biological sex, and psychological gender. We extended previous research by exploring the possibilities for context dependent effects to a greater degree than past studies and by employing multiple measures, thereby reducing the potential for instrument bias and broadening the scope of research. Based on a sample of 291 undergraduates who completed a survey, we found that sex-typed feminine individuals and undifferentiated individuals experienced significantly more communication apprehension than either masculine or androgynous individuals. Masculine individuals were more apprehensive than androgynous ones when the Spence measure of psychological gender was used, but not when the Bem measure of gender was used. In general we found that both measures of psychological gender were more powerful predictors than biological sex. Moreover, we found that the relationship between communication apprehension and psychological gender was predominantly cross-situational rather than context specific. The results also supported the use of Wheeless and Dierks-Stewart's (1981) revision of the Bem scale and compared it to the Spence scale. Finally, suggestions for revision in the PRCA-24 are made.

GENERAL AND CONTEXT DEPENDENT RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN
COMMUNICATION APPREHENSION AND GENDER ROLE ORIENTATION

Research on the link between communication apprehension and broader individual difference variables like gender role orientation is rich in theoretic and applied implications. If the two are indeed related, theorists, therapists, and teachers alike would be in a better position to appreciate the broad etiology of communication apprehension as well as how gender role socialization may contribute to anxiety in communicative situations. And, if the relationship between communication apprehension and gender role also contains context dependent dimensions, then those concerned with treatment gain valuable insights as to the types of contexts in which the sufferer most needs help.

The purpose of this study was therefore oriented around three goals: (1) to extend and replicate previous findings on the general relationship between communication apprehension and gender role orientation; (2) to further search for gender role by situation interactions that may be associated with communication apprehension; and (3) to extend and replicate previous research on the comparative power of psychological gender role vs. biological sex as predictors of communication apprehension.

We focused on communication apprehension (CA) because it taps a broad-based type of anxiety (McCroskey, 1977) and because it is probably the most widely used term. Other potential variables like reticence, shyness, unwillingness to communicate, and loneliness are clearly related to communication

apprehension, although researchers differ on how best to conceptualize the relationship (e.g., Kelly, 1982; Leary, 1983; Lohr at al., 1980; Parks, 1985). Communication apprehension was also chosen because the measurement devices available for it were more situationally sensitive than instruments associated with many of the other concepts. The most recent versions of McCroskey's PRCA (McCroskey, 1982; McCroskey et al., 1985) tap anxiety in four categories of situations: dyadic/interpersonal conversations, group discussions, meetings, and public speeches. While these categories are perhaps crude from a theoretic standpoint, they do at least provide a starting point for examining the context dependent aspects of communication apprehension.

General Association Between Gender and Communication Apprehension

Sex-typed feminine and masculine roles represent extremes in sex role socialization. Each role equips its occupant with a comparatively narrow range of skills. Thus sex-typed roles are often judged to limit the self concepts and human potential of both males and females (Sprague, 1975). More specifically, the role orientation adopted by many sex-typed individuals limits their range of potential responses to situations, causing them to be rigid or inflexible (Forisha, 1978). The androgynous individual, on the other hand, is characterized as reacting flexibly with situationally appropriate behavior rather than narrow sex-typed behavior (Bem, 1974, 1977). Therefore, in comparison to sex-typed feminine and masculine individuals, androgynous individuals should experience less overall communication apprehension across situations because of their broader self-images and more extensive response repertoires.

This hypothesis is also suggested by the strong parallels between descriptions of high and low apprehensives and descriptions of feminine, masculine, and androgynous gender roles. The high CA individual has been described as introverted, low in assertiveness and cooperation, as a risk avoider, as slow to take action, a "go-along" person who lacks self-esteem, self-control and emotional maturity (e.g., Merrill, 1974; McCroskey, 1977). Feminine traits (Chafetz, 1978) which occur in this description include: low assertiveness, passivity, dependence, being quiet, insecure, and emotional (i.e., lacking emotional maturity and control). And, of course, females are often described as having lower self-esteem.

McCroskey (1977) characterized the low CA individual as adventurous, extroverted, confident, emotionally mature, high in self-esteem, disclosive, tolerant of ambiguity, and willing to accept environmental change. The masculine traits (Chafetz, 1978) included in this description are: adventurous, confident, and extroverted. The feminine trait included in this description is disclosiveness. The description also implies that low CA's are sensitive and self-accepting and these qualities in turn are usually associated with the less masculine adult (Hartford et al., 1967; Mussen, 1961). Taken together, these descriptions imply that sex-typed masculine individuals may experience somewhat less overall communication apprehension than sex-typed feminine individuals, but that androgynous individuals, who flexibly combine the strong elements of the other roles, should experience the least communication apprehension. We therefore hypothesized that:

H_1: Feminine, masculine, and androgynous individuals will differ in their overall levels of communication apprehension with feminine types experiencing the highest and androgynous types experiencing the lowest overall CA.

In testing this hypothesis we hope to replicate and extend previous findings. Talley (1979), for instance, found that androgynous subjects experienced lower CA and shyness than masculine and feminine individuals and that masculine individuals experience somewhat less CA than feminine individuals. Other researchers (Greenblatt et al, 1980; McDowell et al., 1978) have reported that androgynous subjects had generally lower levels of CA.

Context Dependent Associations Between Gender and Apprehension

Gender role orientations summarize a package of skills, abilities, and self-images. As we have already noted, this "package" is rather large and varied for androgynous individuals, while it is comparatively smaller and less varied among sex-typed masculine and feminine individuals. Moreover, the skills, abilities, and self-images of masculine individuals tend to be oriented toward different types of social situations than those of feminine individuals. Given this, we should find that androgynous, feminine, and masculine persons differ in terms of the types of situations in which they feel most apprehensive about communicating.

McCroskey (1982) categorized communicative contexts into four types: dyadic conversation, group discussion, group meeting, and public speaking. While these are extremely broad classifications, they do permit us to begin exploring the issue of how gender roles and situations interact to influence communication apprehension.

The stereotypic feminine role is typically viewed as promoting female inferiority. The communication apprehension accompanying this inferiority ought to be highest in situations requiring the sex-typed female to assert her ideas and feelings to a group. This is especially true of those situations that make her the focus of attention for an extended period of time. In such public situations her speech is likely to be viewed as less intelligent, less serious, and less forceful than that of her male counterparts (Bradley, 1980; Lakoff, 1975). Her nonverbal communication is likely to be interpreted as being particularly nonaffiliative when she is in front of or otherwise more distant from the audience or group (Burgoon & Aho, 1982). And, indeed, several studies have reported that females were more anxious about public speaking situations than males (e.g., Feldman & Berger, 1974; Bruskin Associates, 1973; Clevenger, 1959; Gilkinson, 1942; McCroskey et al., 1982; Porter, 1974). However, in the more personal realm of interpersonal communication or in group discussions in which she is likely to to be only one of many speakers who will hold the floor for a short time, the sex-typed female should experience less communication apprehension. She appears more relaxed and affiliative in these situations (Burgoon & Aho, 1982). Her greater ability or willingness to express emotions and self-disclose may be more of an asset in

such situations (e.g., Broverman et al., 1970; Chafetz, 1978; Jourard, 1971). Because of that, she should experience less communication anxiety in these more interpersonal situations (Greenblatt et al., 1980; McCroskey et al., 1982). Thus:

> H_2: Sex-typed females will experience higher CA in public speaking and group meeting contexts than in dyadic conversation or group discussion contexts.

Traditional masculine sex-role socialization, however, calls forth exactly the opposite set of effects. In interpersonal situations their lower willingness or ability to self-disclose, to handle sensitively a quickly changing flow of more personal information may render them less effective (e.g., Broverman et al., 1970; Chafetz, 1978; Greenblatt et al., 1980; Jourard, 1971). In more public situations, on the other hand, sex-typed males tend to be more effective, owing to the fact that their speech is perceived as being more intelligent, serious, and forceful (Bradley, 1980; Lakoff, 1975). Previous studies on biological sex have already found support for this line of reasoning (e.g., McCroskey et al., 1982). We extended the line of argument to hypothesize:

> H_3: Sex-typed males will experience higher CA in dyadic conversations and group discussion contexts than in public speaking or group meeting contexts.

Androgynous individuals should be less likely to experience the strong situational effect hypothesized for their more sex-typed counterparts. As we have noted, their comparatively broad and flexible response repertoire should better equip them for communication in a variety of situations. As a consequence they should experience small situational differences in communication apprehension. There is little past research on this point, but the following hypothesis flows logically from the theoretic perspective outlined above:

H_4: Situational differences in communication anxiety will be smaller for androgynous subjects than for sex-typed masculine and feminine subjects.

Biological Sex vs. Gender Role as Predictors

The theoretic and practical value of conceptualizing sex differences in terms of psychological gender rather than biological sex depends upon what the psychological perspective can reveal that the biological perspective can not. With this in mind, we explored the relative predictive power of gender roles versus biological sex. Previous research findings suggested that gender role orientation might indeed be a stronger predictor of communication apprehension (e.g., Greenblat et al., 1980; McCroskey et al., 1982; McDowell et al., 1978). Our goal was to provide a more extensive test with the following hypotheses:

H_5: Psychological gender role orientation will be a better predictor of subjects' overall level of communication apprehension than will biological sex.

H_6: Psychological gender role orientation will be a better predictor of subjects' communication apprehension in each of the four contexts than will biological sex.

METHOD

Subjects

A total of 291 subjects (124 males, 167 females) were chosen on a volunteer basis from introductory Speech Communication classes at a large Western university. The classes used were primarily service courses and so drew widely from the university population. Subjects ranged in age from 18 to 46 with the average age being 21.36 (SD = 3.83). Almost all were born and raised in the United States. In most cases subjects received extra course credit for participating.

Instruments

Most previous studies on communication apprehension and gender have been limited to single instruments for each variable, usually the PRCA for communication apprehension and Bem's psychological gender scale. In our study, however, two different instruments were deployed to measure each of the central constructs.

Communication apprehension. The first measure used was the 24-item PRCA scale developed by McCroskey (McCroskey, 1982; McCroskey et al., 1985). This instrument devotes 6 items to each of four situational contexts: (dyadic-conversational, group discussion, group meeting, public speaking). Items were measured on 5-point scales and added, thus yielding subscores for each of the four contexts and a total score across contexts. Subscores could range from 6 to 30 and the total score could range from 24 to 120.

The second communication apprehension measure was developed by modifying Spielberger et al.'s (1968) anxiety measure "X". Our instrument, dubbed the "MX-scale", was developed by first selecting six of the terms descriptive of anxiety from Spielberger's instrument: (1) "calm and relaxed", (2) "tense and nervous," (3) "comfortable", (4) "overexcited and 'rattled'", (5) "self-confident", (6) "worried". Subjects were then asked to report how well each of these phrases described them in each of the same four situations used in the PRCA-24. We did, however, modify one feature of McCroskey's situational description. McCroskey described the dyadic-conversational context simply as a "conversation". We added the phrase "in which discussions of feelings and personal matters occur" in order to more accurately tap the gender differences hypothesized in the previous section. Responses on the MX-scale were recorded on 5-point scales and summed to produce the same types of subscores and total as the PRCA-24.

Gender role. Our first measure of psychological gender was based on Bem's (1974, 1977) conceptualization. We chose to use a shortened form suggested by Wheeless and Dierks-Stewart (1981). This form consists of separate 10-item masculinity and femininity subscales. Responses were recorded

on 7-point scales and summed to produce total masculinity and femininity scores which could range from 7 to 70. Next, the sample was split according to the median masculinity score (47.5) and the median femininity score (56.4). Following Bem (1977) we then classified subjects as androgynous (both scores above the median), masculine (masculinity score above median, femininity score below), feminine (masculinity score below median, femininity score above, or undifferentiated (both scores below median).

Spence et al.'s (1974) Personal Attributes Questionnaire (PAQ) was also used to assess gender orientation. Like Bem's measure, this measure generates separate masculinity and femininity scores. Each scale consisted of eight items measured with 5-point responses. Further, although the items differ from Bem's scale, the scoring procedure and classification procedures are the same. Thus the PAQ also classified subjects into androgynous, masculine, feminine, and undifferentiated categories according to the median masculinity (21.2) and femininity (24.02) scores.

Procedures

The final questionnaires were organized with a cover page requesting demographic information (e.g., sex, age, citizenship) followed by the four instruments described above on separate pages. The order in which the four instruments were presented was counterbalanced across the study so as to at least partially reduce the effects of responses sets and fatigue effects.

RESULTS

Reliabilities

Cronbach's alpha was computed to check the internal consistency of the subscales and total for each of the measures of communication apprehension and gender role. Reliabilities for the subscales of the PRCA-24 ranged from .86 for the public speaking context to .91 for the group discussion and meeting contexts. The reliability for the total PRCA-24 was .95. Reliabilities for the subscales of the modified Spielberger instrument, our MX-scale, ranged from .85 for the public speaking context to .88 for the group meeting context, with the reliability of the total being .93.

Wheeless and Dierks-Stewart's modification of the Bem scale also produced acceptable internal consistencies of .86 for the masculinity scale and .87 for the femininity scale. Spence's scale produced lower, but still acceptable, reliabilities for its masculinity (.74) and femininity (.74) subscales.

Tests of Hypotheses

Tests of hypotheses are, of course, dependent upon the measures employed. Because we had two measures for both communication apprehension and psychological gender role, each hypothesis could be tested with a combination of instruments and we could look for a general pattern of findings that was not limited to any one set of measurement choices.

General Association of Apprehension & Gender. The first hypothesis was confirmed by a series of One-Way ANOVA's in which either Bem's or Spence's gender measure served as the independent variable and either the total PRCA-24

score or the total MX score served as the dependent variable. The F-ratio's across the four tests ranged from 13.67 to 28.10 (df = 3,287, all p's < .0001) and were significant in every case. Table 1 reports the descriptive statistics and cell contrasts for each test. As predicted, feminine subjects experienced more communication apprehension than either androgynous or masculine subjects. This was true for both apprehension measures and for both gender role measures. Also as predicted, androgynous subjects reported the lowest levels of CA.

INSERT TABLE 1 HERE

Two other features of these tests warrant attention. While masculine subjects experienced more communication apprehension than androgynous subjects when the Spence scale was used to define gender role, there were no differences between these two groups when the Bem scale was used to define gender role. In addition the results showed that undifferentiated subjects shared the higher levels of CA experienced by feminine subjects.

Context dependent associations The second hypothesis suggested that sex-typed feminine subjects would experience higher CA in public speaking and group meeting contexts than in dyadic or group discussion contexts. This hypothesis was tested with a series of One-way ANOVA's for repeated measures. The F-ratio's across the four tests ranged from were all significant at $p < .0001$).

The descriptive statistics and cell contrasts for each test are presented in Table 2. The general pattern of results supported the hypothesis. Feminine subjects reported their greatest apprehension in public speaking contexts and their lowest apprehension in dyadic contexts in all four tests. Group discussions and meetings were characterized by medium apprehension, as predicted. However, feminine subjects reported about the same level of communication apprehension in the "meeting" and "discussion" contexts in three of the four tests.

INSERT TABLE 2 HERE

The third hypothesis was not supported. Contrary to our expectations, sex-typed masculine subjects reported greater communication apprhension in public speaking contexts than in dyadic contexts. Although this pattern of difference ran opposite our hypothesis, the t-tests used to compare these groups were significant across all four tests ($p < .0001$). Like their feminine counterparts, masculine subjects experienced their greatest apprehension in public speaking settings and their lowest apprehension in dyadic contexts. Also like their feminine counterparts, masculine subjects did not distinguish group meetings from group discussions in terms of the level of communication apprehension each provoked. This similarity held up across all

four tests. Descriptive statistics and cell contrast results are presented in Table 3.

INSERT TABLE 3 HERE

Hypothesis 4 also failed to gain support. Based on the notion that the greater flexibility characteristic of androgynous individuals should equip them to better cope with situational differences, we had hypothesized that androgynous subjects would report smaller situational differences than their sex-typed masculine and feminine peers. This was not the case, as the pattern of means and cell contrast results in Table 4 illustrates. Situational differences among androgynous subjects generally echoed those for sex-typed subjects. If anything, androgynous subjects' anxiety seemed to be more situationally influenced. In addition to the sharp difference between dyadic and public speaking contexts witnessed with the other groups (Tables 2 & 3), androgynous subjects reported greater apprehension on the PRCA-24 for meetings than for discussions.

INSERT TABLE 4 HERE

Biological sex vs. Psychological gender. The pattern of results thus far follows much of what we expect for men and women. The question arises, therefore, if either the Bem or Spence conceptualizations of psychological gender add predictive power that could not already be realized from biological sex. Hypotheses 5 and 6 suggested that they could and both of these hypotheses were strongly supported by the results presented in Table 5. In order to test hypotheses 5 and 6, we computed a series of ANOVA's in which either biological sex, Bem's gender role categories, or Spence's gender role categories served as the independent variable. The dependent variable was one of the anxiety measures. Using multiple classification analysis, we then computed an estimate of the R^2 linking the independent and dependent variables. By comparing these we can judge the relative predictive power of each variable.

INSERT TABLE 5 HERE

The results plainly showed that biological sex failed to predict either total or situational communication apprehension. In fact all but one of the R^2's was .00 and that one was .01. Both measures of psychological gender role were more powerful predictors, accounting for between 6% and 23% of the variance in communication apprehension scores. Finally, although their predictive powers were quite similar, the Bem scale as revised by Wheeless and Dierks-Stewart (1981) was a slightly more powerful predictor than Spence's PAQ scale.

DISCUSSION

The purpose of this study was to replicate and extend previous research on the relationship between communication apprehension, biological sex, and psychological gender. We extended previous research by exploring the possibilities for context dependent effects to a greater degree than past studies and by employing multiple measures, thereby reducing the potential for instrument bias and broadening the scope of research.

We believe our results have implications in three areas: (1) the relationship between communication apprehension and psychological gender role, (2) the way in which psychological gender has been operationalized, and (3) the clarity of the PRCA-24 as a measure of communication apprehension in broadly defined contexts.

First of all, we found clear differences in the overall level of communication apprehension experienced by subjects of differing psychological genders. Feminine individuals reported higher levels of communication apprehension across all measures than androgynous or masculine individuals. This finding replicated previous findings (e.g., Greenblatt et al., 1980; McDowell et al., 1978; Talley, 1979). In addition we found that when psychological gender was operationalized with the scale developed by Spence et al. (1974), masculine individuals reported greater communication apprehension than androgynous individuals. These findings supported our general theoretic rationale which had suggested that sex-typed individuals should experience greater apprehension

than androgynous individuals because their communication skills and expectations oriented them to a narrower range of situational competencies than did those of androgynous individuals. Finally, we found that individuals who were classified as undifferentiated in terms of psychological gender were likely to experience the greatest overall communication apprehension. This finding extends our theoretic perspective by suggesting that undifferentiated individuals are even narrower than sex-typed individuals in their range of competencies because they are weaker on those sex role based competencies that are actually adaptive. Although other researchers have not analyzed undifferentiated individuals in detail, our findings suggest that they merit further attention.

The results of this study also demonstrated that the relationship between communication apprehension and psychological gender is relatively free of context dependent interactions. Considering the broad pattern across all the tests reported in Tables 2 to 4, it is apparent that people experience the least communication apprehension in dyadic contexts, more apprehension in group contexts, and the greatest apprehension in public speaking contexts. This is true regardless of whether their psychological gender is feminine, masculine, or androgynous. That is, the results portray a strong main effect for situational differences, but little evidence of an interaction between situational differences and differences in psychological gender. It does appear that feminine subjects experienced greater communication apprehension in meetings and public speaking contexts, but the overall pattern of findings suggests that the relationship between communication apprehension and psychological gender is general rather than context-specific.

A second contribution of this research project was to compare alternative measures of psychological gender role. Previous researchers in this area have restricted themselves to the operationalization developed by Bem (1974, 1977). We employed a revised version of the Bem scale suggested by Wheeless and Dierks-Stewart (1981) as well as a second measure of psychological gender developed by Spence and her colleagues (1974). Our results demonstrated that the revised version of the Bem scale was not only slightly more reliable than the Spence scale, but also a somewhat better predictor of communication apprehension. The Spence scale, however, more successfully discriminated between androgynous and masculine individuals in terms of their overall communication apprehension. Aside from this difference, the two scales yielded quite similar results. The two scales were not, however, equivalent. Their final classifications of the individuals into the four gender roles were only moderately correlated ($\underline{r} = .44$, $\underline{p} < .0001$) and they only agreed 54% of the time. The Bem and Spence scales appear to tap somewhat different portions of the rather global concept of psychological gender.

The final contribution of this research is to the continuing evaluation of the PRCA-24, the latest revision of the standard communication apprehension measure. Perhaps the biggest limitation of the study was that our ability to detect context dependent effects may have been blurred by the ambiguity of the situational cues in the PRCA-24. The phrases and terms used to describe the four contexts (dyadic, discussion, meeting, public speech) are so brief as to be ambiguous and are so broad as to prevent detection of precise situational differences. Our results showed that subjects generally did not discriminate

between the discussion context and the meeting context. Communication apprehension levels did not differ between these two contexts in nine of our 12 comparisons. Furthermore, the correlation between the scores for these two contexts tended to be higher across our analyses than the correlations among other combinations of contexts. These findings may suggest that the two contexts are not well specified in the instrument and, perhaps more generally, that the clarity of all of its situational descriptions might be improved.

Table 1

OVERALL DIFFERENCES IN COMMUNICATION APPREHENSION FOR GENDER ROLE TYPES

Means and (Standard Deviations)

Comm. App.	Using the Bem Measure			
	Feminine	Androgynous	Masculine	Undifferentiated
PRCA-24	72.46 (16.99)[a]	56.82 (13.80)[b]	57.71 (14.01)[b]	73.52 (13.67)[a]
MX	66.10 (14.93)[a]	56.15 (13.21)[b]	56.53 (12.87)[b]	68.05 (13.66)[a]
Comm. App.	Using the Spence Measure			
	Feminine	Androgynous	Masculine	Undifferentiated
PRCA-24	69.12 (16.93)[a]	55.24 (15.74)[b]	61.88 (15.06)[c]	71.74 (14.05)[a]
MX	65.03 (15.33)[a]	53.07 (12.97)[b]	59.62 (13.94)[c]	66.98 (12.60)[a]

Notes: Within a given row, cells with differing superscripts differ at the $p < .05$ level or beyond. $\underline{n}$'s = 291

Table 2

CONTEXT DIFFERENCES IN COMMUNICATION APPREHENSION FOR FEMININE GENDER ROLE

Means and (Standard Deviations)

Comm. App.	For Bem's Feminine Role			
	Dyadic	Discussion	Meeting	Speech
PRCA-24	15.04 (4.73)[a]	17.86 (5.68)[b]	18.46 (5.24)[b]	21.10 (4.19)[c]
MX	11.80 (3.76)[a]	16.80 (5.39)[b]	16.30 (5.27)[b]	21.10 (4.48)[c]
Comm. App.	For Spence's Feminine Role			
	Dyadic	Discussion	Meeting	Speech
PRCA-24	14.64 (4.72)[a]	16.68 (5.04)[b]	17.57 (4.96)[c]	20.23 (4.72)[d]
MX	12.21 (3.67)[a]	16.32 (5.26)[b]	15.81 (5.30)[b]	20.68 (4.69)[c]

Notes: Within a given row, cells with differing superscripts differ at the $p < .01$ level or beyond. Df's for cell contrasts = 69

Table 3

CONTEXT DIFFERENCES IN COMMUNICATION APPREHENSION FOR MASCULINE GENDER ROLE

Means and (Standard Deviations)

Comm. App.	For Bem's Masculine Role			
	Dyadic	Discussion	Meeting	Speech
PRCA-24	12.45 (3.03)[a]	13.84 (4.18)[b]	13.97 (4.60)[b]	17.45 (5.00)[c]
MX	11.74 (3.99)[a]	13.34 (4.53)[b]	12.92 (3.71)[b]	18.53 (4.97;[c]
Comm. App.	For Spence's Masculine Role			
	Dyadic	Discussion	Meeting	Speech
PRCA-24	13.12 (3.43)[a]	15.09 (4.76)[b]	14.96 (4.87)[b]	18.71 (5.19)[c]
MX	12.75 (4.42)[a]	13.99 (4.50)[b]	13.44 (4.09)[ab]	19.44 (5.17)[c]

Notes: Within a given row, cells with differing superscripts differ at the $p < .05$ level or beyond. Df's for cell contrasts = 72 to 76.

Table 4

CONTEXT DIFFERENCES IN COMMUNICATION APPREHENSION FOR ANDROGYNOUS GENDER ROLE

Means and (Standard Deviations)

Comm. App.	For Bem's Androgynous Role			
	Dyadic	Discussion	Meeting	Speech
PRCA-24	11.90 (3.91)[a]	12.99 (4.35)[b]	14.37 (4.12)[c]	17.56 (4.51)[d]
MX	11.56 (3.81)[a]	12.96 (4.29)[b]	13.14 (4.44)[b]	18.49 (4.65)[c]
Comm. App.	For Spence's Androgynous Role			
	Dyadic	Discussion	Meeting	Speech
PRCA-24	11.37 (3.89)[a]	12.37 (5.10)[b]	14.27 (5.00)[c]	17.22 (4.68)[d]
MX	10.59 (3.78)[a]	12.19 (4.71)[b]	12.54 (4.31)[b]	17.75 (4.25)[c]

Notes: Within a given row, cells with differing superscripts differ at the $p < .05$ level or beyond. Df's for cell contrasts = 72 for the Bem scale & 58 for the Spence scale..

Table 5

COMPARISON OF BIOLOGICAL SEX VS. PSYCHOLOGICAL GENDER

AS PREDICTORS OF COMMUNICATION APPREHENSION

	R^2: Biological Sex	R^2: Bem Gender Role	R^2: Spence Gender Role
Total Apprehension			
PRCA-24	.00	.23	.14
MX	.00	.14	.13
Dyadic Apprehension			
PRCA-24	.00	.16	.13
MX	.00	.07	.06
Discussion Apprehension			
PRCA-24	.00	.18	.12
MX	.00	.13	.12
Meeting Apprehension			
PRCA-24	.00	.19	.10
MX	.00	.11	.09
Public Speaking Apprehension			
PRCA-24	.00	.14	.07
MX	.01	.08	.07

Notes: N's = 291. F-ratios for biological sex were all nonsignificant, F-ratios for Bem and Spence scales were all significant ($p < .001$).

REFERENCES

Bem, S.L. (1974). The measurement of psychological androgyny. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 42, 155-162.

Bem, S.L. (1977). On the utility of alternative procedures for assessing psychological androgyny. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 45, 196-205.

Bradley, P.H. (1980). Sex, competence, and opinion deviation: An expectation states approach. Communication Monographs, 47, 101-110.

Broverman, I.K., Broverman, D.L., Clarkson, F.E., Rosenkrantz, P.S. & Vogel, S.R. (1970). Sex-role stereotypes and clinical judgments of mental health. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 34, 1-7.

Bruskin Associates. (1973). What are Americans afraid of? The Bruskin Report. No. 53.

Burgoon, J.K. & Aho, L. (1982). Three field experiments on the effects of violations of conversational distance. Communication Monographs, 49, 71-88.

Chafetz, T.S. (1978). Masculine, feminine or human? Itasca, Ill.: F.E. Peacock.

Clevenger, T. (1959). A synthesis of experimental research in stage fright. Quarterly Journal of Speech, 45, 134-145.

Feldman, M.L. & Berger, C.R. (1974). Verbal dogmatism: Its explication, measurement, and relationship to interpersonal attraction. Paper presented at the annual convention of the Speech Communication Association. Chicago, Illinois.

Forisha, B.L. (1978). Sex roles and personal awareness. Morristown, N.J.: Scott Foresman.

Gilkinson, H. (1942). Social fears as reported by students in college speech classes. Speech Monographs, 9, 141-160.

Greenblatt, L., Hasenauer, J.E. & Freimuth, V.S. (1980). Psychological sex type and androgyny in the study of communication variables: Self-disclosure and communication apprehension. Human Communication Research, 6, 117-129.

Hartford, T.C., Willis, C.H. & Deabler, H.L. (1967). Personality correlates of masculinity-femininity. Psychological Reports, 21, 131-136.

Jourard, S.M. (1971). Self-disclosure: An experimental analysis of the transparant self. New York: John Wiley.

Kelly, L. (1982). A rose by any other name is still a rose: A comparative analysis of reticence, communication apprehension, unwillingness to communicate, and shyness. Human Communication Research, 8, 99-113.

Lakoff, R. (1975). Language and woman's place. New York: Harper & Row.

Leary, M.R. (1983). The conceptual distinctions are important: Another look at communication apprehension and related constructs. Human Communication Research, 10, 305-312.

Lohr, T.M., Rea, R.G., Porter, B.B., & Hamberger, L.K. (1980). Communication fear: A correlational study of trait generality. Human Communication Research, 6, 280-284.

McCroskey, J.C. (1977). Oral communication apprehension: A summary of recent theory and research. Human Communication Research, 4, 78-96.

McCroskey, J.C. (1982). An introduction to rhetorical communication. (4th ed.) Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall.

McCroskey, J.C., Beatty, M.J., Kearney, P. & Plax, T.G. (1985) The content validity of the PRCA-24 as a measure of communication apprehension across situations. Communication Quarterly, 33(3), 165-173.

McCroskey, J.C., Simpson, T.J. & Richmond, V.P. (1982). Biological sex and communication apprehension. Communication Quarterly, 30(2), 129-132.

McDowell, E.E., McDowell, C.E., Hyerdahl, J., & Steil, L.K. (1978). A multivariate study of demographics, psychological sex-roles and communication apprehensions. A paper presented at the annual convention of the Speech Communication Association. Mineapolis, Minnesota.

Merrill, D. (1974). Reference survey profile. Denver: Personal Predictions and Research.

Mussen, P.H. (1961). Some antecedents and consequents of masculine sex-typing in adolescent boys. Psychological Monographs, 75, 506.

Parks, M.R. (1985). Interpersonal communication and the quest for personal competence. Pp. 171-201 in M.L. Knapp & G.R. Miller (eds.) Handbook of Interpersonal Communication. Beverly Hills, Ca.: Sage Publications.

Porter, D.T. (1974). Self-report scales of communication apprehension and autonomic arousal (heart rate): A test of construct validity. Speech Monographs, 41, 267-276.

Spence, J.T., Helmreich, R. & Stapp, J. (1974). The personal attributes questionnaire: A measures of sex-role stereotypes and masculinity-femininity. J.S.A.S. Catalog of Selected Documents in Psychology, 4, 127.

Spielberger, C.D., Gorsuch, R.L. & Lushene, R.E. (1968). The state-trait anxiety inventory: Preliminary test manual for form X. Tallahassee, Florida: Florida State University.

Sprague, J. (1975). The reduction of sexism in Speech Communication education. Speech Teacher, 24, 37-45.

Talley, M.A. (1979). The relationship of gender orientation to communicator style. Unpublished master's thesis. West Virginia University.

Wheeless, V.E. & Dierks-Stewart, K. (1981). The psychometric properties of the Bem sex-role inventory: Questions concerning reliability and validity. Communication Quarterly, 29, 173-186.